

**In the United States Court of Federal Claims**  
**OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS**  
**No. 23-0689V**

J.W.,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND  
HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

Chief Special Master Corcoran

Filed: July 24, 2025

*Leah VaSahnja Durant, Law Offices of Leah V. Durant, PLLC, Washington, DC, for  
Petitioner.*

*Eleanor Hanson, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for Respondent.*

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO REDACT<sup>1</sup>**

On May 9, 2023, J.W. filed a petition for compensation under the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program, 42 U.S.C. §300aa-10, *et seq.*<sup>2</sup> (the “Vaccine Act”). Petitioner alleges that she suffered a shoulder injury related to vaccine administration (“SIRVA”) caused by a Human Papillomavirus vaccine administered on April 28, 2022. Petition at 1. On August 2, 2024, I issued a decision awarding Petitioner an amount agreed upon by the parties. ECF No. 32.

---

<sup>1</sup> Because this unpublished Order contains a reasoned explanation for the action in this case, I intend to post it on the United States Court of Federal Claims' website, in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002. 44 U.S.C. § 3501 note (2012) (Federal Management and Promotion of Electronic Government Services). **In light of my conclusion below, I intend to post this Order with a redacted caption.** To the extent Petitioner would seek further redaction, in accordance with Vaccine Rule 18(b), Petitioner has 14 days to identify and move to redact medical or other information, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy.

<sup>2</sup> National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, Pub. L. No. 99-660, 100 Stat. 3755. Hereinafter, for ease of citation, all section references to the Vaccine Act will be to the pertinent subparagraph of 42 U.S.C. § 300aa (2018).

On August 6, 2024, Petitioner filed a timely motion for redaction, requesting that I “redact her name from the Decision and the attached Proffer.” Motion for Redaction at 1, ECF No. 33. Explaining that “her personal information was accessed by one or more third parties for the purpose of committing identity theft” (*id.*) in 2018, Petitioner maintains that she possesses “legitimate fears that the identity thief/thieves will attempt to steal the monetary compensation she is being awarded through the Vaccine Injury Program if her financial and medical information is made public” (*id.* at 2). Petitioner adds that the identity thieves have made multiple attempts to access her current financial accounts and to open new accounts under her name – the last attempt occurring in November 2023. *Id.* at 1-2.

In his response, dated August 8, 2024, Respondent states that he “does not believe it is appropriate to advocate in favor of disclosure of petitioner’s information in any particular case, including this one, but rather defers to [my] judgment.” Response to Petitioner’s Motion to Redact Decision at 5, ECF No. 34. Petitioner has not filed a reply.

I have previously discussed in other decisions the Vaccine Act’s treatment of requests to redact Program decisions and rulings. See generally *K.L. v. Sec’y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, No. 12-0312V, 2015 WL 11387761, at \*2-4 (Fed. Cl. Spec. Mstr. Feb. 27, 2015), *mot. for review den’d*, 123 Fed. Cl. 497 (2015) (denying a request to redact petitioner’s name and description of illnesses). Generally, information provided in vaccine proceedings may not be disclosed without the written consent of the party providing the information. Section 12(d)(4)(A); Vaccine Rule 18(a). The Act requires disclosure of the decisions of the special masters or the court but provides for redaction of certain categories of information – “medical files and similar files” – but only if the disclosure of such information “would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of privacy.” Section 12(d)(4)(B); *accord.* Vaccine Rule 18(b).

The Vaccine Rules allows the initials of a minor to be used in the petition’s caption when filed. Vaccine Rule 16(b). Although adult petitioners’ names are not afforded this automatic protection, they may be redacted if the movant establishes proper grounds for so doing. See generally *W.C. v. Sec’y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, 100 Fed. Cl. 440, 460-61 (Fed. Cl. 2011) *aff’d*, 704 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2013) (analogizing Vaccine Act’s privacy concerns to treatment of similar issues under the Freedom of Information Act, claimant’s name was properly subject to redaction from decision); *but see Langland v. Sec’y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, No. 07-0036V, 2011 WL 802695, at \*7-8 (Fed. Cl. Spec. Mstr. Feb. 3, 2011), *mot. for rev. denied on non-relevant grounds*, 109 Fed. Cl. 421 (2013) (petitioners not entitled to redaction of names from decision where they failed to establish compelling grounds for so doing). There is a notable public interest in knowing the vaccination and medical information related to a petitioner’s injury but no public interest

in knowing a petitioner's name. *A.K. v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs.*, No. 09-0605V, 2013 WL 322918, at \*2 (Fed. Cl. Spec. Mstr. Jan. 17, 2013).

*W.C.* and *Langland* stand as two somewhat-opposed interpretations of how strict the standard for obtaining redaction should be. *Langland* adopts a more stringent approach, while *W.C.* emphasizes a balancing test that weighs a petitioner's privacy interests against "the public purpose of the Vaccine Act." *W.C.*, 100 Fed. Cl. at 460-61; *K.L.*, 2015 WL 11387761, at \*2-3. In either case, however, a petitioner needs to make *some* showing to justify the relief of redaction; redaction is not available simply at a petitioner's beck and call. *W.C.*, 100 Fed. Cl. at 460 (balancing of interests favors redaction "where an objection [to disclosure] is made on *reasonable grounds*") (emphasis added). I have permitted redaction in cases where such a specialized showing was made without reconciling these two competing standards or choosing one over the other. See, e.g., *K.L. v. Sec'y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, No. 12-0312V, 2015 WL 11882259 (Fed. Cl. Spec. Mstr. Oct. 30, 2015) (granting petitioner's second request to redact only her name to initials which was accompanied by additional information regarding the potential harm she may suffer regarding her employment).

Under the correct standard, a petitioner's general concern for privacy, shared by many vaccine case petitioners, is not sufficient to warrant redaction, especially when there is a strong public interest in the information's disclosure. See *W.C.*, 100 Fed. Cl. at 461. But claimants can make individualized showings going beyond such general preferences that persuasively establish grounds for redaction. Here, Petitioner has presented a credible argument that disclosure of the damages decision awarding her compensation for her SIRVA could adversely impact her.

There is a notable public interest in knowing the vaccination and medical information related to a petitioner's injury, but no public interest *per se* in knowing a petitioner's name. *A.K. v. Sec'y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, No. 09-0605V, 2013 WL 322918, at \*2 (Fed. Cl. Spec. Mstr. Jan. 17, 2013). Granting Petitioner's request to redact her name to reflect her initials only has both been justified by the Motion, and is not contrary to the Program's policy concerns about publicizing its entitlement decisions.

### Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above, I hereby determine that Petitioner has established grounds for redaction of her name in the Decision issued on August 2, 2024, and accompanying Proffer. I therefore **GRANT the motion filed by Petitioner on August 6, 2024, at ECF No. 33.**

The Clerk of this Court is hereby instructed to change the caption of this case to the caption above.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

**s/Brian H. Corcoran**

Brian H. Corcoran  
Chief Special Master